

Appl. No. 10/813,851

Amdt. Dated May 8, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office action mailed March 22, 2006. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

In the specification, paragraph [0026] has been amended. Support for the amendment is found at least in the Abstract of the Disclosure.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 21 are pending in this application, with Claim 1 being the independent claim. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-5, and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,634,377 (Stafford) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,706,851 (Lopez-Gomez et al.), or under Stafford in view of Lopez-Gomez et al. and U.S. Pat. No. 5,725,007 (Stubbs). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, includes, among other features, providing a replacement poppet made of a second material. As set forth in the application, this feature results in increased wear life of the replacement poppet over the original material. This feature is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the prior art of record.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claim 1 is patentable over the prior art. It similarly follows that Claims 3-5

Appl. No. 10/813,851

Amtd. Dated May 8, 2006

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

and 21 are likewise patentable as dependent from Claim 1, as well as the additional features of these Claims.

II. Conclusion

In view of Applicant's amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 103 have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the application, as amended, is now in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: May 8, 2006

By: Sean D. Johnson

Sean D. Johnson
Reg. No. 56,383
(480) 385-5060